DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 379 928 FL 022 773

AUTHOR Larrivee, Pierre
TITLE Negative Association in Quebec French.
PUB DATE 93
NOTE 18p.
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom Use - Teaching Guides (For Teacher) (052)
LANGUAGE English; French

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Foreign Countries; *French; French Canadians; *Language Patterns; Language Research; Language Variation; *Morphology (Languages); Morphophonemics; *Negative Forms (Language); Structural Grammar; Tagmemic Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *French (Canadian); *Quebec

ABSTRACT

In Quebec French, unlike standard French, sentence negation "pas" ("not") can occur in the same clause as a negative quantifier like "personne" ("nobody"), for instance. This paper proposes that "pas" in these contexts marks negative association in the same way that "ne" does in standard French. The paper is organized into two parts. The first part shows that negative association in Quebec French obeys the general constraints to which it is submitted in standard French. The second part evaluates, in the light of the relevant facts, the existing analyses of negative association and suggests a treatment relying on coindexing, along the lines of Muller (1991). The Quebec French data show that the general hypothesis of Zanuttini (1988) on negative concord doesn't hold. It is obvious that in Quebec French, as in standard French, "pas" is a VP modifier and still exhibits concord. It follows that concord cannot be correlated with the syntactic status of negation in a language and can be considered as constituting a parameter of its own. Sample sentences are given, for example, "Je ne dirai a personne de partir" (standard French); "Je dirai pas a personne de partir" (Quebec French); "I won't tell anybody to leave" (English translation for both sentences above.) (Contains 35 references.) (CK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Pierre Larrivée
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Pierre Larrivée

Negative Association in Quebec French[1]

ED 379 928

1. Introduction

In Quebec French as in several other dialectal and sociolectal varieties of French but unlike standard French, sentence negation *pas* "not" can occur in the same clause as a negative quantifier like *personne* "nobody" for instance:

(1) *Il (ne) a pas vu personne.*
He ne has not seen nobody
"He didn't see anybody."

This paper proposes that *pas* in these contexts marks negative association, in the same way that *ne* does in standard French. Negative association is the concord relationship between negations in a given clause with a single negative interpretation. The paper is organized into two parts. In the first part, it will be shown that negative association in Quebec French obeys the general constraints to which it is submitted in Standard French. The second part evaluates, in the light of the relevant facts, the existing analyses of negative association and suggests a treatment relying on coindexing, along the lines of Muller (1991).

2. Negative Association

Negative association between sentence negation and the negative quantifier must be realized within the limits of a syntactic domain (Kayne 1983, Lemieux 1982, Milner 1979). Hence, in the following examples (from Daoust-Blais 1975:75):

(2) a. *Il y a que personne n' est venu.*
There there has that nobody ne is came
"The fact is that nobobdy came."
b. * *Il y a personne qui n' est venu.*
There there has nobody who ne is came.
"There isn't anybody that came."
c. *Il n' y a personne qui est venu.*
There ne there has nobody who is came

FL022773

[1]Parts of this paper were prepared for Claude Poirier's seminar on dialectal variation during the 1993 winter term at Université Laval. I'd like to thank him as well as Jean-Marcel Léard for their comments and advices. I'd also like to thank the students of that seminar as well as my own students who have helped to check the data. I'm further deeply indebted to Stefan Frisch who read and commented a previous version of this paper. Thanks finally to my colleague Peter Enns who has checked my English.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"There isn't anybody that came."

ne is unacceptable as an association marker when it is in a different domain than that of the negative quantifier *personne*; it can only be used as a sentence negation, leading to a double negation reading[1]:

(3) *Il y a personne qui n' est venu.*
There there has nobody who ne is came
"There isn't anybody that didn't come."

Similarly, in Quebec French:

(4) a. *Il y a que personne est pas venu.*
There there has that nobody is not came
"The fact is that nobobdy came."
b.* *Il y a personne qui est pas venu.*
There there has nobody who is not came
"There isn't anybody that didn't come."
c. *Il y a pas personne qui est venu.*
There there has not nobody who is came
"There isn't anybody that came."

pas changes status from an association marker to a sentence negation when in a different domain than that of the negative quantifier[2], leading to a double negation reading.

The following sentences, in standard:

(5) a. *Je ne dirai à personne de partir.*
I ne will-tell to nobody of to-leave
"I won't tell anybody to leave."
b. * *Je dirai à personne de ne partir. (Kayne 1983:39, n. 4)*
I will-tell to nobody to ne to-leave
"I won't tell anybody to leave."

and in Quebec French:

(6) a. *Je dirai pas à personne de partir.*
I will-tell not to nobody of to-leave
"I won't tell anybody to leave."
b. * *Je dirai à personne de pas partir.*
I will-tell to nobody of not to-leave

---

[1] This reading is limited to formal style; thus, *ne* would be required in the main clause to mark association with *personne*, as association is compulsory in this style of French.

[2] It is unclear what the status of *pas* is in the following sentence (adapted from Kayne 1983:24):

a. ? *J' ai pas exigé qu' ils arrêtent personne.*
I have not demanded that they arrest nobody.
"I didn't ask them to arrest anybody."

mainly because of the uncertain status of the structure itself (Lemieux 1982:179, Muller 1991:353-354).

"I won't tell anybody to leave."

further illustrate the necessity for the association marker to be in the same domain as that of the negative quantifier. In this case, and contrarily to *pas*:

(7) a. *Je dirai à personne de pas partir.*
"I will tell no one not to leave."

ne cannot have a sentence negation status:

b. * *Je dirai à personne de ne partir.*
"I will tell no one not to leave."

since *ne* as a sentence negation has a limited distribution (see Larrivée, in press).

The presence of a specified subject which apparently determines in some cases a syntactic domain diminishes the acceptability of negative association in standard (see Milner 1979:84):

(8) a. *Je ne vois personne parler à Jean.*
I ne see nobody to-talk to Jean
"I don't see anyone talking to Jean."

b. ? *Je ne vois Jean parler à personne.*
I ne see Jean to-talk to nobody
"I don't see Jean talking to anyone."

c. *Je ne le vois parler à personne.*
I ne him see to-talk to nobody
"I don't see him talking to anyone."

and Quebec French:

(9) a. *Je vois pas personne parler à Jean.*
I see not nobody to-talk to Jean
"I don't see anyone talking to Jean."

b. ? *Je vois pas Jean parler à personne.*
I see not Jean to-talk to nobody
"I don't see Jean talking to anyone."

c. *Je le vois pas parler à personne.*
I him see not to-talk to nobody.
"I don't see him talking to anyone."

The position of the quantifier with respect to the infinitive further induces parallel variations in the acceptability of association in both varieties under study:

(10) a. ? *Elle n' a envie de rien voir.* (Kayne 1983:39, n. 4)
She ne has envy of nothing to-see
"She doesn't feel like seeing anything."

b. ? *Elle n' envisage de jamais revenir.* (Kayne 1983:39, n. 4)
She ne considers of never to-come-back.
"She doesn't consider ever coming back."

(11) a. ? *Elle a pas envie de rien voir.*
She has not envy of nothing to-see

"She doesn't feel like seeing anything."

b. ? *Elle envisage pas de jamais revenir.*
She considers not of never to-come-back
"She doesn't consider ever coming back."

The only notable difference between *ne* and *pas* is their behavior with respect to preposed negative modifiers; thus, while such constituents can associate with *ne*:

(12) *Jamais je n' y suis allé.*
Never I ne there am gone
"Never did I go there."

(13) *À aucun de ces garçons elle ne veut que tu parles.* (Kayne 1983:39, n.4)
To none of these boys she ne wants that you talk
"None of these boys does she want you to talk to."

their association with *pas* is barely if at all possible:

(14) * Jamais j' y suis pas allé.
Never I there am not gone
"Never did I go there."

(15) ?? *À aucun de ces garçons elle veut pas que tu parles.* (Kayne 1983:39, n.4)
To none of these boys she wants not that you talk
"None of these boys does she want you to talk to."

Indeed, (14) can only be interpreted with a double negation reading:

(16) *Jamais j' y suis pas allé.*
"In no cases I didn't go there."

This might be due to the fact that the constituents adjoined to the sentential node lie outside of the domain of the VP modifier *pas*, but inside that of the sentence modifier *ne* (on the functions of *pas* and *ne*, see Larrivée 1993:49-50).

Hence, *pas* marks negative association in Quebec French in the same fashion as *ne* does in standard French.

Further, the negative quantifier must have scope over the verbal predicate (Damourette et Pichon 1940:150, Larrivée 1993:59ff, Muller 1991:346) in order to trigger negative association. Thus, in the following sentences:

(17) a. *Elle se satisfait de rien.*
She herself satisfies of nothing
"She is satisifed with very little."

b. *Elle ne se satisfait de rien.* (SF)
She ne herself satisfies of nothing
"She isn't satisfied with anything."

c. *Elle se satisfait pas de rien.* (QF)
She herself satisfies not of nothing

"She isn't satisfied with anything."

the presence of *ne* and *pas* marks the negation of the verbal predicate. Likewise, in literary French, the presence of the association marker *ne* distinguishes in polarity contexts the quantifier use of *personne* that takes semantic scope over the verbal predicate:

(18) a. *Je ne crois pas que personne ne les connaisse.*
I ne believe not that nobody ne them knows
"I don't think that nobody knows them."

from the polarity item use of *personne* still found in this style

b. *Je ne crois pas que personne les connaisse.*
I ne believe not that anybody them knows
"I don't think anybody knows them."

Similarly, a negation that modifies specifically a quantifier or an embeded adjective, for instance, does not trigger association since it fails to entail the negation of the verb:

(19) a. *Pas plus de cinq (*ne) sont venus.* (SF)
No more of five ne are came
"No more than five came."

b. Pas plus de cinq sont (*pas) venus. (QF)
No more of five are not came
"No more than five came."

(20) a. *Un gars pas très gentil (*ne) nous a crié après.* (SF)
A guy not very nice ne to-us has shouted after
"A not very nice guy shouted at us."

b. *Un gars pas très gentil nous a (*pas) crié après.* (QF)
A guy not very nice to-us has not shouted after
"A not very nice guy shouted at us."

These facts lead to the unexpected conclusion that each associated negative item retains its negative value; this is confirmed by *plus* "no more" for instance which in all varieties of French retains its value whether it marks association or not:

(21) a. *Il n' y va plus.*
He ne there goes no-more.
"He doesn't go there anymore."

b. *Personne n' y va plus.*
Nobody ne there goes no-more.
"Nobody goes there anymore."

This provides a readily explanation for the fact that association markers are realized once no matter how many negative quantifiers there are in a clause:

(22) a. *Personne ne va jamais nulle part.*
Nobody ne goes never nowhere
"Nobody ever goes anywhere."

b. * *Personne ne ne ne va jamais nulle part.*

Nobody ne ne ne goes never nowhere
"Nobody ever goes anywhere."

c. *Personne va pas jamais nulle part.*
Nobody goes not never nowhere
"Nobody ever goes anywhere."

d. * *Personne va pas pas pas jamais nulle part.*
Nobody goes not not not never nowhere
"Nobody ever goes anywhere."

Likewise, it explains why sentential negation doesn't trigger an association marker:

(23) a. * *Il ne ne peut.*
He ne ne can
"He can't."

b. * *Il y est pas pas allé.*
He there is not not gone
"He didn't go there."

and why *ne* and *pas* can still both associate with a negative quantifier in Quebec French:

(24) *Il n' a pas rien dit à personne.*
He ne has not nothing said to nobody
"He didn't say anything to anybody."

3. Current Analyses of Association

Various analyses have been proposed to account for negative association.

Ever since Klima (1964), many analyses have assumed that negative association is a polarity phenomenon (Ladusaw 1991, Piñón 1993:398, Progovac 1993:50-51) where one item is taken to be the 'real' negation which licenses all the other negative elements analyzed as negative polarity items (NPIs). This analysis has been proposed to account for association phenomena in Quebec French (Daoust-Blais 1975, Lemieux 1982, Vinet 1982). Thus, in the following sentences:

(25) a. *Je n' ai vu personne.* (SF)
I ne have seen nobody
"I haven't seen anybody."

b. *J' ai pas vu personne.* (QF)
I have not seen nobody
"I haven't seen anybody."

ne and *pas* are taken to licence *personne* which is analyzed as a NPI.

This analysis however disregards the distinct distribution of negative quantifiers and NPIs (von Bremen 1986, DeGraff 1993:75-78, Haegeman 1993, Muller 1984:64ff, Muller 1991:316ff, Zanuttini 1988:540ff). While negative quantifiers can be used without an association marker in colloquial and Quebec French:

(26) *J'ai vu personne.* (CF, QF)
I have seen nobody
"I haven't seen anybody."

NPIs require the presence of a licensing negation:

(27) a. *Je n' ai pas vu qui que ce soit.* (SF)
I ne have not seen anybody
"I haven't seen anybody."
b. * *J' ai vu qui que ce soit.* (SF)
I have seen anybody
"I haven't seen anybody."

NPIs can further be licensed by polarity elements, not negative quantifiers. Similarly, in all varieties, negative quantifiers can be used alone as answers, but not NPIs:

(28) *Qui as- tu vu?*
Who have you seen?
"Who did you see?"
a. - *Personne.*
"Nobody."
b. - * *Qui que ce soit.*
"Anybody."

Quantifiers can be modified by *presque* "almost" but not polarity items[1]:

(29) a. *Il n' a vu presque personne.* (SF)
He ne has seen almost nobody.
"He has seen almost nobody."
b. * *Il n' a pas vu presque qui que ce soit.* (SF)
He ne has not seen almost anybody
"He has seen almost nobody."

NPIs are sensitive to the surface position of the licensing negation (Williams 1994:239-241):

(30) a. *Il n' a rien dit à qui que ce soit.* (SF)
He ne has nothing said to anybody
"He didn't say anything to anyone."
b. ?* *Il n' a dit quoi que ce soit à personne.* (SF)
He ne has said anything to nobody.
"He didn't say anything to anyone.

(31) a. *Il n' y est pas allé qui que ce soit.* (SF)
There ne there is not gone anybody
"There didn't go anybody there."
b. *Jamais qui que ce soit n' y est allé.* (SF)
Never anybody ne there is gone

---

1 This is probably due to the fact that while the NPI *qui que ce soit* requires to be licensed by the scope of negation, PPI *presque* refuses to figure in that scope.

"Never did anybody go there."

c. * *Qui que ce soit n' y est pas allé.* (SF)
Anybody ne there is not gone
"Anybody didn't go there."

but negative quantifiers are not:

(32) *Il n' a rien dit à personne.* (SF)
He ne has nothing said to anybody
"He didn't say anything to anyone."

(33) a. *Il n' y est allé personne.* (SF)
There ne there is gone nobody
"There didn't go anybody there."

b. *Jamais personne n' y est allé.* (SF)
Never nobody ne there is gone
"Never did anybody go there."

c. *Personne n' y est allé.* (SF)
Nobody ne there is gone
"Nobody went there."

d. *Personne y est pas allé.* (QF)
Nobody there is not gone
"Nobody went there."

Thus, a polarity analysis of negative association lead to suppose that only the first in a sequence of negative items is the real negation, which entails a counterintuitive change in the status of *plus*, *jamais* and *personne* in the following sentences (Muller 1984:69):

(34) a. *Plus jamais!*
No-more never!
"Never again!"

b. *Jamais plus!*
Never no-more!
"Never again!"

c. *Plus jamais personne ne vient.*
No-more never nobody ne comes
"Nobody ever comes here anymore."

d. *Plus personne ne vient jamais.*
No-more nobody ne comes never
"Nobody ever comes here anymore."

e. *Personne ne vient jamais plus.*
Nobody ne comes never no-more
"Nobody ever comes here anymore."

The rejection by certain speakers of *Personne y est pas allé* (Daoust-Blais 1975:89ff, Vinet 1982:174) which has been taken as a proof of the NPI status of *personne* in Quebec French might in fact be due to the general difficulty of interpreting indefinite subjects of negative sentences:

(35) a. ?? *Du monde y est pas allé.*
Of-the people there is not gone
"Some people didn't go there."
b. * *Un homme y est pas allé.*
A man there is not gone
"Not a man went there."

It might also be due to a particular construal of the syntactic domain of association. In any case, this is remindful of Italina negative quantifier *nessuno* "nobody" which cannot while in subject position associate with the sentence negation *non* "not" (Haegeman 1993, Rizzi 1982, Zanuttini 1988):

(36) a. *Nessuno (*non) ho mangiato.*
Nobody not has eaten
"Nobody has eaten."
b. *(Non) ho mangiato nessuno.
Not has eaten nobody
"Nobody has eaten."

Thus, the polarity analysis improperly assimilates quantifiers and polarity items.

Negative association does not depend on the nature of the associated negations but on the nature of the relationship between those negations.

The second analysis proposes that the negations are related at some level of representation.

It has been proposed (Haegeman et Zanuttini 1991, Haegeman 1993, Pollock 1989) that negative elements associate at D-structure in a hypothetical negative projection (NegP); thus, the following sentence:

(37) *Je n' ai vu personne.*
I ne have seen nobody
"I haven't seen anybody."

personne would be generated as the specifier of *ne*, which is the head of NegP:

(38) [NegP [SpecNeg personne][Neg ne]

This categorial model faces the problem of the optionality of the association markers in colloquial French:

(39) *Je (n') ai vu personne.*
I ne have seen nobody
"I haven't seen anybody."

the negative quantifier would constitute in such cases the specifier of a headless projection[1], which

---

1 *Pas* remains in Quebec French a specifier of NegP, as opposed to Haitian (DeGraf 1993) and Mauritian (Adone 1993) creoles for instance where it syntactically behaves like the head of NegP.

would violate x-bar theory principles. Most varieties of French would turn up with an empty head projection, since *ne* is most often omitted; according to Sankof and Vincent (1977) and Lemieux (1982), *ne* is omitted in 95% of negative sentences in Quebec French. This situation would force to suppose that the association marker *ne* remains present at S-structure but is deleted at PF level in order to satisfy the requirements of x-bar structures (Haegeman 1993, Ouhalla 1990:190ff). Clitic placement data however bar this solution since in standard French while the presence of *ne* impedes clitic postposition in imperative context:

(40) a. *Ne le dis à personne!*
Ne it say to nobody!
"Don't say it to anybody!"
b. * *Ne dis-le à personne!*
Ne say-it to nobody!
"Don't say it to anybody!"

the clitic can be preposed or postposed to the verb in the absence of *ne*:

(41) a. *Le dis à personne!*
It say to nobody!
"Don't say it to anybody!"
b. *Dis-le à personne!*
Say-it to nobody!
"Don't say it to anybody!"

which leads to suppose that *ne* is absent at least in the second case, thus creating an irrecoverable violation of x-bar theory[1].

Furthermore, in contexts of multiple associated negations:

(42) *Personne ne dit plus guère jamais rien à personne.* (SF)
Nobody ne says no-more not-much never nothing to nobody.
"Nobody ever says anything much to anyone anymore."

Even if *pas* were analyzed as a head, its optionality would raise the same problems as the optionality of *ne*; such an analysis would further leave unexplained the status of *ne* in that variety.

[1] Stefan Frisch notifies me that:

> "[t]here is a paper by [Speas (1994)] which proposes that the head position can be radically empty if the specifier position is occupied. (The proposal was made to deal with pro-dop, but it works nicely with negation.) I have been using this proposal in my analysis of Middle English negation changing from *ne* system to the *ne V not* system, to the *not* system. The change is one from a head-licensed NegP to a specifier-licensed NegP with an intermediate step in between where the NegP is redundantly licensed."

This analysis changes radically the assumptions about syntactic structures; in any case, it would have to be restricted tofunctional projections, as classical specifiers like determiners and complementizers are in no way able to licence by themselves NPs and Ss.

the negative elements that cannot figure either in the head or specifier position of NegP are adjoined at D-structure to the specifier of the negative projection (Haegeman 1993); thus (42) would be represented as follows:

(43) [NegP [SpecNeg' personne [SpecNeg' rien [SpecNeg' jamais [SpecNeg' guère [SpecNeg' plus [SpecNeg personne]]]]]][Neg ne]]

It is probable that such a complex adjunction would lead to some problem in the course of derivation.

The hypothesis of a negative phrase is more generally problematic, given the reverse D-structure ordering of *pas* and *ne* with respect to their S-structure (Ouhalla 1990:190, Hirschbühler and Labelle 1993) and the required verb movement across this maximal projection which is barred by the binding theory[1] (Ernst 1992, Ouhalla 1990).

Lemieux (1982) proposes that the association marker *pas* in Quebec French is the specifier of the negative quantifier. This is supported by data such as the following:

(44) a. *Personne y est pas allé.* (QF)
Nobody there is not gone
"Nobody went there."

b. *Pas personne y est allé.* (QF)
Not nobody there is gone.
"Nobody went there."

Similarly, for Williams (1986:271), the association marker *ne* is base-generated as an adjunct to the negative quantifier and then moved to its surface position (Williams 1986:271). However, as formulated, both models would give rise to several association markers in multiple associated negation contexts:

(45) a. * *Personne ne ne n' a rien dit à personne.* (SF)
Nobody ne ne ne has nothing said to nobody
"Nobody said anything to anyone."

b. * *Personne a pas pas pas rien dit à personne.* (QF)
Nobody has not not not nothing said to nobody
"Nobody said anything to anyone."

Association could be realized at LF (see for instance Haegeman and Zanuttini 1991). However, it is unclear how multiple association and the absence of the association marker could be handled at this level. It must also be pointed out that polarity and scope (see Linebarger 1981) as well as association can all be treated at LF, and it is once again unclear how these different phenomena are distinguished at this level of representation. For instance, in literary French, *qui que ce soit* and *personne* can both be used as negative quantifiers:

(46) a. *Je n' ai vu personne.*

---

1 According to Stefan Frisch, *ne* forms a syntactic word with the verb and moves along it; it thus would not constitute a barrier to binding.

I ne have seen nobody
"I didn't see anybody."

b. *Je n' ai vu qui que ce soit.*
I ne have seen nobody
"I didn't see anybody."

and NPIs:

(47) a. *Je doute qu' il voit qui que ce soit.*
I doubt that he sees anybody.
"I doubt that he's seeing anybody."

b. Je doute qu' il voit personne.
I doubt that he sees anybody
"I doubt that he's seing anybody."

Likewise, some representation is necessary to distinguish negative association and negative scope relationships between *pas* and *personne* in Quebec French:

(48) a. *Je n' ai pas vu personne.*
I ne have not seen nobody.
"I haven't seen anybody."

b. *Je n' ai pas vu personne; j' ai vu Max.*
I ne have not seen nobody; i have seen Max.
"I haven't seen nobody; i saw Max."

Associated negations can be related through coindexing at S-structure, as proposed by Muller (1991:321ff) and indirectly by Milner (1979) and Aoun (1985). In the same respect that coindexed pronouns evoque the same reference, coindexed negations partake of the same negative value[1]. Coindexing provides sufficient flexibility to account for the various observed association patterns:

(49) a. *J'ai vu personne.*
b. *Je n'ai pas vu personne.* (QF)
c. *Personne ne dit plus guère jamais rien à personne.* (SF)

It allows to stipulate within that general framework more specific requirements for other dialectal varieties, such as the forbidden association between *pas* and a negative quantifier in standard French. Coindexing further allows to capture the domanial constraint on association, since coindexing is naturally realized within a given syntactic domain. It also allows to account for the semantic constraint, since this model doesn't suppose the subordination of negative items to one another in any respect. Such data as the following:

(50) *Je t' ordonne de ne plus jamais ne rien faire.* (Muller 1991:325)
I to-you order of ne no-more never ne nothing do.

---

1 However, while pronouns are coindexed with a referential antecedent, there doesn't seem to be in negative association relationships one referential negation from which other negative items would depend.

"I order you not to do nothing anymore."

confirm a coindexing analysis in the respect that the presence of two association markers signals two different series of association which in turn induce the double-negation reading. The following interaction, discussed along with other cases by Corblin (in press:section 4.4), similarly confirms a coindexing analysis:

(51) - *Qui n' a rien fait?*
Who ne has nothing done?
"- Who didn't do anything?"
- *Personne.*
Nobody
"- Nobody."

as *personne* is involved in a different relationship than other negative quantifiers, which bring about the double-negation reading.

Haegeman and Zanuttini (1991) discus some data from West Flemish that would allegedly preclude a coindexing analysis of association. They consider that a the fact that a negative quantifier doesn't give rise to association when coordinated with a non-negative NP, as in the following example:

(52) *Il (*ne) gagnera tout ou rien.*
He ne will-win all or nothing.
"He will win (either) all or nothing."

constitutes a counterexample to a binding analysis. This is assuming that simplex NPs behave in the same respect as coordinated NPs with respect to binding relationships, an assumption that contradict the following examples:

(53) a. *Valère$_i$ a vu la photo de son frère et lui$_{i/j}$.*
Valère has seen the photograph of his brother and him
"Valère saw the photograph of his brother and him."
b. *Valère$_i$ a vu la photo de lui *$_{i/j}$.*
Valère has seen the photograph of him
"Valère saw the photograph of him."

Indeed, negative quantifiers do not get involved with an association marker when coordinated with a NP of positive value; they behave like `local' negations and do not seem to affect the verbal predicate, as opposed those cases where it is the first member of the coordinated structures:

(54) *Il ne gagnera rien ou alors tout à la fois.*
He ne will-win nothing or then everything at the time
"He will win either nothing or everything at once."

and where it does take semantic scope over the predicate.

Negative association thus can be conceived of as a coindexing relatioship between full-fledged negations.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, I have shown that Quebec French exhibits negative association similar to that of Standard French, and obeys parallel constraints, in line with the general hypothesis that a language dialectal varieties are governed by the same underlying principles (Roberge et Vinet 1991). I have proposed to analyze association as a coindexing relationship between negations, and provided arguments against analyses resorting to polarity, functional projection or LF.

The Quebec French data show that the general hypothesis of Zanuttini (1988) on negative concord doesn't hold. She claims that languages with concord have a surface marker in Infl node; languages with negation inside VP do not exhibit concord allegedly because the negation raises to LF where it takes wide scope over the sentence. Yet, it is obvious that in Quebec French as in Standard French *pas* is a VP modifier, and still exhibits concord. It follows that concord cannot be correlated with the syntactic status of negation in a language, and can be considered as constituting a parameter of its own.

5. References

Adone, Dany. 1993. *The Acquisition of Mauritian Creole*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Aoun, Joseph. 1985. *A Grammar of Anaphora*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

von Bremen, Klauss. 1986. "Le problème des forclusifs romans." *Linguisticae investigationes* 10,2.223-265.

Corblin, François. in press. "Multiple Negation Processing." *UMLI Proceedings: Dynamic Approaches in Languages, Logic and Information* ed. by E. Ejerhed and S. Lindstrom.

Damourette, Jacques and Édouard Pichon. 1940. *Des mots à la pensée. Essai de grammaire de la langues française*. 7. Paris: D'Artrey.

Daoust-Blais, Denise. 1975. *L'influence de la négation sur certains indéfinis en français québécois*. PhD, Université de Montréal.

DeGraff, Michael. 1993. "A riddle on Negation in Haitian." *Probus* 5,1/2.63-94.

Dowty, David. 1993. "Deductive versus Semantic Account of Reasoning: The Relevance of Negative Polarity and Negative Concord Marking." *CLS 29*. 2. 91-124..

Ernst, Thomas. 1992. "The Phrase Structure of English." *The Linguistic Review* 9,2. 109-144.

Frisch, Stefan. 1994. "Evidence for Economy of Projection in Historical Change." ms.

Gaatone, David. 1971. *Étude descriptive du système de la négation en français contemporain*. Genève: Droz.

Haegeman, Liliane. 1993. "Negative Concord: some speculations on agreement." ms.

Haegeman, Liliane and Raffaella Zanuttini. 1991. "Negative Heads and the *Neg* Criterion." *The Linguistic Review* 8.233-251.

Hirschbühler, Paul and Marie Labelle. 1993. "Le statut de (ne) pas en français contemporain." *Recherches Linguistiques à Vincennes* 22.31-58.

Kayne, Richard. 1983. *Connectedness and binary branching*. Dordrecht : Foris.

Klima, Edward. 1964. "Negation in English." *The Structure of Language* ed. by Jerry Fodor and

Jerrold Katz, 246-323. New York: Prentice Hall.

Ladusaw, William. 1991. "Interpreting Negative Concord Structures." ms.

Larrivée, Pierre. in press. *"Ne*, négation de propositions virtuelles." *Revue Romane* 31,1.

Larrivée, Pierre. 1993. *Contribution à l'étude psychosystématique de l'adverbe NE en français contemporain*. MA, Université Laval.

Lemieux, Monique. 1982. "La négation dans la théorie du liage et du gouvernement." *Revue québécoise de linguistique* 12,1.169-199.

Milner, Jean-Claude. 1979. "Le système de la négation en français et l'opacité du sujet." *Langue française* 44.80-105.

Muller, Claude. 1991. *La négation en français*. Genève: Droz.

Muller, Claude. 1984. "L'association négative." *Langue française* 60.59-94.

Ouhalla, Jamal. 1990. "Sentential Negation, Relativized Minimality and the Aspectual Status of Auxiliaries." *The Linguistic Review* 7,2.183-231.

Piñón, Christopher. 1993. "SigmaP and Hungarian." *The Proceedings of the Eleventh West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* ed by Jonathan Mead. 388-404. Standford: Standford Linguistic Association.

Progovac, Ljiljana. 1993. "Subjunctive: the (mis)behavior of anaphora and negative polarity." *The Linguistic Review* 10.37-59.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. "Negation, WH-Movement, and the Null Subject Parameter." *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Foris: Dordrecht. 117-184.

Roberge, Yves and Marie-Thérèse Vinet. 1991. *La variation dialectale en grammaire universelle*. Montréal and Sherbrooke: PUM and PUS.

Sankoff, Gillian and Dianne Vincent. 1977. "L'emploi productif de "ne" dans le français parlé à Montréal." *Le Français moderne* 45.243-256.

Speas, Margaret. 1994. "Null arguments in a Theory of Economy of Projection." *University of Massachussetts Occasonal Papers in Linguistics* 17.179-208.

Vinet, Marie-Thérèse. 1982. "Remarques sur la quantification en québécois." *Revue de l'association*

québécoise de linguistique 2,2.169-176.

Williams, Edwin. 1994. *Thematic Structure in Syntax*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Williams. Edwin. 1986. "A Reassignment of the Functions of LF." *Linguistic Inquiry* 17.265-299.

Zanuttini, Rafaella. 1988. "Two Strategies for Negation: Evidence from Romance." *ESCOL '88*. 535-546.